## REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application in light of the present amendment and remarks is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-18 have been rejected.

Claim 20 has been added.

Claims 1-18 have been amended.

Claims 1-18 and 20 are pending in this application.

Claims 1-5 have been provisionally rejected under obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 3-6 of the copending Application No. 09/944892. Applicants respectfully request that this provisional rejection be held in abeyance until allowable subject matter is determined, inasmuch as claims 1-5 have been completely recast. At that time, and if appropriate, a terminal disclaimer may be filed.

Claims 1-18 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Razavi et al (WO 00/77620) in view of Oliveira et al (US 6,579,208), further in view of Lee et al (US 6,609,127). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Independent claims 1 and 13 have been recast to reflect that redundant data can be provided over different paths on a vehicle network. The data also includes instructions, such as routing instructions, that can be used by nodes of the network to take action on the data passing therethrough, thereby forming a dynamic (active) network. Support for this can be found in the specification on page 21 lines 15-19, page 6 lines 6-11, and page 8 lines 4-5.

Advantageously, applicants' invention of claims 1 and 13 provides a solution for connecting vehicle specific devices and external devices to a common network while also providing fault tolerance through active (dynamic) routing.

The Examiner admits that Razavi fails to disclose device coupling through an active network for controlling the flow of data. Therefore, Razavi could not suggest or disclose parallel coupling of redundant data on an active network, as recited in amended claim 1 and 13.

Oliveira discloses coupling of devices using serial data transfer on a vehicle bus. However, Oliveira does not suggest or disclose sending redundant data on a parallel active network architecture, as recited in amended claim 1 and 13.

Similarly, Lee discloses coupling of devices using serial data transfer on a single bus. However, Oliveira does not suggest or disclose sending redundant data on a parallel active network architecture, as recited in amended claim 1 and 13.

Claim 2 has been recast to recite sending redundant data on different paths. Support for this can be found in the specification on page 8 lines 13-14.

Claim 3 has been recast to recite sending repeated redundant data on the same path. Support for this can be found in the specification on page 8 lines 12-13.

Claim 4 has been recast to recite dynamic generation of path depending upon network status. Support for this can be found in the specification on page 10 lines 5-6 and page 6 lines 6-10.

Claim 5 has been recast to recite data that is independent from device. Support for this can be found in the specification on page 7 line 25 to page 8 line 2.

Claims 6 and 14 have been recast to recite synchronization of redundant data on different paths. Support for this can be found in the specification on page 10 lines 8-9.

Claims 7 and 15 have been recast to recite a spanning tree algorithm to determine different paths. Support for this can be found in the specification on page 10 lines 12-17.

Claims 8 and 16 have been recast to recite sending timing information for synchronization. Support for this can be found in the specification on page 10 lines 8-9.

Claims 9 and 17 have been recast to recite timing propagation from a root node. Support for this can be found in the specification on page 10 lines 18-20.

Claims 10 and 18 have been recast to recite establishing timing delays. Support for this can be found in the specification on page 10 lines 20-24.

Claim 11 has been recast to recite timing refreshment. Support for this can be found in the specification on page 11 lines 10-11.

Claim 12 has been recast to recite an isolated network zone that can only be used under certain conditions. Support for this can be found in the specification on page 11 line 24 to page 12 line 13.

Claim 20 has been added to recite sending redundant data on different paths. Support for this can be found in the specification on page 13 lines 21-23.

Moreover, claims 2-12 and 20 are dependent on amended claim 1, and therefore include all of the recitations of claim 1, which are not disclosed or suggested by the references. Similarly, claims 14-18 are dependent on amended claim 13, and therefore include all of the recitations of claim 13, which are not disclosed or suggested by the references.

None of the cited reference, in combination or alone, suggest or disclose any one of the following novel aspects of applicants' invention: an active parallel network, sending redundant data, synchronizing the redundant data, using a spanning tree to assign paths, providing timing information, using root propagation for timing, establishing delays, periodic refreshment, and a threshold zone.

The Examiner's comments with respect to by Razavi, Oliveira and Lee no longer apply to applicants' invention, in view of the recast claims. For the foregoing reasons, applicants believe that claims 1-18, as amended, and 20 are patentably distinct and non-obvious from all of the references of record, whether taken alone or in combination.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that this rejection has been overcome.

The other references of record have been reviewed and applicant's invention is deemed patentably distinct and nonobvious over each taken alone or in combination.

For the foregoing reasons, applicants respectfully request that the above rejections be withdrawn.

Inasmuch as this amendment distinguishes all of the applicants' claims over the prior art references, for the many reasons indicated above, passing of this case is now believed to be in order. A Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

No amendment made was related to the statutory requirements of patentability unless expressly stated herein. No amendment made was for the purpose of narrowing the scope of any claim, unless applicant has argued herein that such amendment was made to distinguish over a particular reference or combination of references.

Authorization is hereby given to charge any fees necessitated by actions taken herein to Deposit Account 50-2117.

Please note the new correspondence address below.

Respectfully submitted,
**Remboski et al.**

By: _____
Brian M. Mancini
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Registration No. 39,288
Phone: (847) 576-3992
FAX: (847) 576-3750

New correspondence address:
**Customer Number 22917**
Motorola, Inc.
Law Dept. - 3rd floor
1303 E. Algonquin Rd.
Schaumburg, IL 60196